DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 332 EC 201 293

AUTHOR Tillona, Salvatore
TITLE Enhancing Success of Mainstream Elementary Special Education Students by Teaching Social Skills and Monitoring Behavior and Academic Progress.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 101p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Elementary Education; *Interpersonal Competence; *Mainstreaming; Peer Teaching; *Social Support Groups; Student Placement; Teacher Attitudes; *Transitional Programs; Tutoring

ABSTRACT

Five elementary special education students were mainstreamed to a regular classroom for portions of their school day. A support team, consisting of the school psychologist, the principal, and the guidance counselor, was established to monitor their progress and provide assistance with both behavioral and educational problems. Peer tutors were provided to help each mainstreamed student with his/her academic skills, and lessons in social skills were also given. Results showed that the students were successful both socially and academically, and that the social skills lessons carried over to the classroom. Results also showed that the participating teachers had a positive attitude towards the mainstreaming experience. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

8470

PRACTICUM REPORT

ED289332

Center for the
Advancement of Education
Ed.D. Program

Enhancing Success of Mainstream Elementary Special Education Students by Teaching Social Skills and Monitoring Behavior and Academic Progress

by

Salvatore Tillona

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 201293

3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314
305/475-7300

NOVA UNIVERSITY

Enhancing Success of Mainstream Elementary Special Education Students by Teaching Social Skills and Monitoring Behavior and Academic Progress

by

Salvatore Tillona

Cluster XX

A Practicum (I) Report Presented to the Ed.D. Program
in Early and Middle Childhood
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1986

EC 201293

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Salvatore V. Tillona

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: _____
Mr. Nastasi, Principal

September, 1986

This practicum report was submitted by Salvatore Tillona under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. program in Early and Middle Childhood and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

_____
E. Riley Holman, Ed.D.,
Adviser

2-27-87
Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to acknowledge Dr. E. Riley Holman, practicum advisor, whose continual guidance, thoughtful criticism and helpful advise made this report possible. In addition, the writer wishes to express special indebtedness to the principal, Mr. Nastasi, the teachers and especially the students involved in the practicum for their enthusiasm, inspiration and honesty.

Finally, the writer wishes to thank his wife, Carol, and children, Thomas and Susanne, for their patience, encouragement and assistance in this undertaking.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Table of Contents		iii
Chapter		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Description of Community	1
	Author's Work Setting and Role	2
II	STUDY OF THE PROBLEM	4
	Problem Description	4
	Problem Documentation	5
	Problem Analysis	5
	Related Literature	6
III	ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS	16
	Statement of General Goals	16
	Behavioral Expectations	16
	Standard of Performance	17
	Evaluation and Assessment Instrument	19
	Plans for Analyzing Data	21
IV	SOLUTION STRATEGY	23
	Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions	23
	Description and Justification for Solution Selected	30
	Calendar Plan for Action	33
	Report of Action Taken	35
V	RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
	Results	41
	Conclusions	57
	Recommendations	58
	Dissemination	60
	REFERENCES	62

ABSTRACT

Enhancing Success of Mainstream Elementary Special Education Students by Teaching Social Skills and Monitoring Behavior and Academic Progress. Tillona, Salvatore V., 1987: Practicum Report, Nova University, Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood. Descriptors: Elementary Education / Mainstreaming / Normalization (Handicapped) / Student Placement / Transitional Programs / Special Education / Special Schools / Exceptional Persons / Counseling / Reinforcement / Social Skills / Interpersonal Competency / Counseling Techniques

This practicum addressed the need for mainstreaming special education students in regular classes. In a review of the literature, the writer found that many mainstreaming plans failed because few plans provided for teaching social skills to the mainstreamed special education students and were not closely monitored. Many plans just placed the special education students in a regular classroom with little preparation or on-going monitoring of their needs.

The writer's goals were: (1) to help special education students be mainstreamed into regular classrooms, so that they function both academically and socially; (2) to provide a support team approach for the mainstreamed students which establishes regular monitoring and on-going assistance, in terms of behavioral and educational problems; (3) to provide peer tutoring for each of the mainstreamed students to help with the academic skills; (4) to provide the mainstreamed students with social skills through social skills lessons; (5) to promote a positive attitude towards mainstreaming in the regular classroom teacher; (6) to promote satisfaction and a positive attitude towards mainstreaming in special education teachers.

The results showed that the five special education students mainstreamed were successful both socially and academically. In addition, there was evidence that the social skills taught carried over to the classroom. Further, there was overwhelming evidence that there was a positive attitude towards, and satisfaction in, mainstreaming on the part of the teachers and students involved.

Page

Appendices

Appendix A	Student Self Evaluation Form	65
Appendix B	Recording Log	67
Appendix C	Mainstrema Monitoring Form	69
Appendix D	Tutor's Log	71
Appendix E	Student Social Skills Questionnaire .	73
Appendix F	Teacher Evaluation Social Skills Survey	76
Appendix G	Regular Teacher's Self Evaluation Form	78
Appendix H	Special Educator's Evaluation Form . .	81
Appendix I	Social Skills Checklist	84
Appendix J	Lesson Plans	86

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Community

The setting for this practicum is an elementary school of more than 900 students in a lower socioeconomic area. The majority of the families were either welfare receipients or working poor. The ethnic composition of the school was about 55% Puerto Rican and 45% Black. The remainder of the district, which serviced approximately 30,000 children from pre-Kindergarten through ninth grade was primarily Puerto Rican. There was a large minority of lower middle class white families. The district's composition of lower middle class included Polish, Italian, and Jewish families. The housing in the district consisted of: lower middle class, two through six family dwellings, welfare projects, and two lower middle income housing complexes.

There was a large industrial section and its proximity to a major city made the area desirable for small and medium sized manufacturing and service industries. The area was anchored by a large international pharmaceutical firm, and a large industrial commercial, and consumer cleaning firm. Each of these firms have invested heavily in expanding its plant and equipment in the area. In addition, there were hundreds of small to medium-sized companies that either provided services or are manufacturers

of industrial products. However, there are few employment opportunities existing for community residents and there is little benefit to the community as a result of these industries.

Author's Work Setting and Role

The writer is a guidance counselor for the more than 800 students in the regular classes in the school. Over the past 18 years with the school his duties have included: teaching grades first through fifth, usually the more difficult children; diagnostic math teacher in the special needs program; and administrative assistant to the principal. The writer currently is a guidance counselor. His duties include individual counseling of students with emotional and behavioral problems; leading group sessions with children experiencing a variety of problems to encourage verbalization of emotions; providing and encouraging fruitful methods of coping with such counterproductive feelings as anger and hostilities; referral of students for placement in special educational programs; referral of students and their families to community agencies and hospitals for counseling; acting as a liaison for the school between the troubled families and the social agencies; conducting staff and grade conferences with teachers to familiarize them with procedures concerning referrals and placement; and familiarizing parents with the services available to them through the guidance office.

The parents in the school were generally poorly educated. They were generally unsophisticated concerning psychological counseling, and, therefore, they were reluctant to avail themselves of the services provided by the Board of Education or the community. Similarly, the administration and the teaching staff tended to categorize most children with behavioral and learning difficulties as candidates for special education programs. It is the guidance counselor's role as a member of the school-based support team to evaluate the educational and emotional needs of the students. Then when their needs were assessed, the counselor must encourage and support the parents and teachers to implement the plan of action. The counselor then acted as a liaison for the school, the home and the agency or bureau involved.

Chapter II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

There are approximately 75 special education children. They came to the school through the committee on the handicapped of the district; the majority of the children were from different schools throughout the district. They were tested, classified and placed in a special education class appropriate for their disabilities; that is, learning disabled, emotionally handicapped and neurologically impaired. Since the passage of Public Law 94-142 in 1976, the federal government mandated that handicapped children must be placed in the least restrictive environment and, in accordance with that law, mainstreaming has become an effective tool for placing handicapped students in regular classrooms. Therefore, handicapped students who are recognized to be ready both socially and academically to return to the regular classroom were mainstreamed.

Through informal interviews with the crisis intervention teacher and several of the more experienced special education teachers in the school, several students were identified as candidates for mainstreaming. The school should be mainstreaming special education students who are ready both socially and academically for the regular classroom. Therefore, the problem was that presently there are no special education

students being mainstreamed.

Problem Documentation

The school had been cited by a state task force monitoring schools for being in noncompliance with state regulations concerning mainstreaming special education students. As a result, the newly appointed principal had asked the writer to identify children, through teacher recommendations, to participate in mainstreaming and to develop a program for mainstreaming these children in regular classrooms.

Problem Analysis

In the preliminary investigation of the problem, several causes were identified. The first was an apparent reluctance of special educators to identify children to be mainstreamed. This came from a basic mistrust that exists between regular and special educators. The feeling among regular educators is that they generally must teach seven or eight disabled and/or emotionally disabled children, as the special educator does; but the regular educator had 20 to 25 additional children which special educators did not have. The second point was that the regular educators perceived fear of special education students and their disruptive behavior in the classroom. Most regular educators believed that a special education student will disrupt his class and therefore prevent him from teaching. There is a

general lack of understanding and cooperation. The third cause is the lack of leadership from the past administration. The preceeding principal viewed the special educators and his students as a separate entity, an isolated unit, which should not be integrated with the regular school program. He neither encouraged nor wanted any integration of the two groups. He perpetuated the suspicions and mistrust between regular and special educators. The fourth cause was the district's lack of initiative in encouraging schools to attempt to successfully mainstream special education students. The district made no attempt to mainstream special education students. The district's main concern was to control the monies allocated to special education. Therefore, it had no interest in mainstreaming special education students into regular classrooms. The fifth cause was failure of the school-based support team to initiate mainstreaming programs for special education students through their recommendations on the Individual Education Plans. It was the function of the school-based support team to reevaluate the special education student. In addition, the team should look at that reevaluation in terms of possible mainstreaming where appropriate. This aspect of the reevaluation process was overlooked.

Related Literature

It is important here to begin with a definition for mainstreaming proposed and adopted by the Delegate Assembly

of the Council for Exceptional Children.

> Mainstreaming is a belief which involves an educational placement procedure and process for exceptional children, based on the conviction that each child should be educated in the least restrictive environment in which his/her educational and related needs can be satisfactorily provided. This concept recognizes that exceptional children have a wide range of special educational needs, varying greatly in intensity and duration; that there is a recognized continuum of educational settings which may, at any given time, be appropriate for an individual child's needs; that to the maximum extent appropriate, exceptional children should be educated with nonexceptional children. (April 1976)

The underlying assumption of this definition, according to Gillet (1983), is that the lack of success of the learner is not the sole result of a learner's failure, but the failure of the learning environment as well. In most instances, a change in the learning environment's educational program could adequately serve the learning styles and social needs of the exceptional child. The idea is correct that special education students are unable to learn or their learning patterns are extremely different from the regular education child. The behavior of many handicapped children is similar to the behavior of troublesome children where teachers have been successfully educating in their classrooms. In many instances, the difference is that these troublesome children have not been labeled and isolated as special education students. Thornburgh (1980) concurs, stating, "Most mainstreamed kids aren't that different from some of the children teachers have been teaching

all along." (p. 161) The label, he contends, frightens the regular classroom teacher.

Ryan (1984) offers a solution that is supported by others that special educators have the main responsibility for fostering the right atmosphere for handicapped children in a school.

The implementation of mainstreaming as a result of PL94-142, and the call to integrate handicapped children in the mainstream of the educational system to the greatest extent possible will mean greater demands on the regular teacher. The regular teacher's role will require more than the traditional instructional role. Stainback, Stainback, Courtnage and Javen (1985) summarize several important studies that concluded: "The only consistent findings indicate that mainstreaming works when regular classroom teachers are able to adopt instruction for the students in their classroom." (p. 144) Therefore, the role of the teacher and the structure of the classroom must be altered in order for mainstreaming to be successful.

Simpson and Edwards (1980) report that "attention must be given to the mainstreamed child's instructional integration, individualized instruction, in addition to basic rights, responsibilities and freedom similar to his peers." (p. 60)

The writer will first examine the regular classroom teacher's role in mainstreaming as advanced by Mori (1979)

including: facilitating of integration, diagnosing problems, planning instruction, providing learning experiences, evaluation progress, membership in a treatment team, and helping parents. In facilitating of integration of the mainstreamed child, the regular classroom teacher was the primary person in the success or failure of mainstreaming. The regular teacher had a greater role in the instruction of handicapped children. He/she worked collectively with specialists to ease the way of the handicapped child into the mainstream. He/she fostered positive attitudes concerning the rights of all children and particularly the handicapped to an education and respect for individual differences as they relate to the way the child learns or behaves. He/she must understand and cope with negative feelings towards the handicapped child. Simpson & Edwards (1980) concurred with this and stated, "A classroom environment which will facilitate the educational success of the student to be mainstreamed is also an important aspect of classroom selection." (p. 62)

The regular classroom teacher must show great flexibility concerning class size and composition. Further, the regular teacher must be willing to confront and attempt to solve the tremendous problems that are encountered in mainstreaming. In the role of planner, the teacher must prepare goals and instructional objectives. The handicapped child must learn

in his unique style. This is done through individualized instruction, through learning centers, media centers, etc.

In his/her role as evaluator of the progress of the mainstreamed student, greater accountability was required. However, in the role as member of the treatment team, he/she will have an important contributing role in maximizing the mainstreamed student's educational experience.

With respect to the structure of the classroom, Stainback, Stainback, Courtnage and Jaben (1985) included: individualized programing with objectives and materials geared to the individual needs of each child; cooperative activities, grouped with common goals; and adaptive environments, with individualized educational plans for all students.

Simpson and Edwards (1980) suggest some classroom strategies the regular teacher should include, such as: determining instruction and frustration levels of the child so that early academic work will insure success; using materials with a high interest value; controlling length and difficulty level of assignments; ensuring immediate feedback on independent assignments as close to completion as possible; using immediate reinforcement; using token reinforcement; and arranging seating in close proximity to the teacher. They suggest ways of creating an appropriate atmosphere for the handicapped child. They include: discussions on the concept of exceptionality, common handicapping conditions, similarities

and differences between regular and special education pupils, in addition to individual characteristics that make us unique, heterogenity of people, etc.

Gillet (1983) includes descriptions of the most successful models of mainstreaming programs used throughout the United States. Their success was determined by a survey sent to directors of special education at state intermediate and local levels. One of these programs included the use of paraprofessionals and volunteers to provide individual instruction with mainstreamed students in the regular classroom. They furnished the individual instruction, providing repetition and reinforcement. These paraprofessionals were given training and prepared plans by which they could assist handicapped students in the mainstream.

A second program made use of peer tutoring, where students in the mainstream regular classroom supplied the necessary academic reinforcement as well as the by-product of social interaction.

Heron (1978) describes an approach that can be used with any academic or behavioral problem that may occur. The first phase is to define the problem and determine where to focus the change. The question has three parts: (1) Can the problem be solved by focusing on the mainstreamed child's behavior? (2) or the behavior of his peers? (3) or the teacher's behavior. If the problem deals with either academic failure

or behavior of the mainstreamed child, the initial step is to adapt and restructure the learning environment to better adjust to his/her learning style. In the case of a behavioral problem, many times this increase of personalized environment will decrease the problems. Many academic problems are caused by the failure to reinforce basic skills and prerequisite skills. Some ways of reinforcing basic or prerequisite skills include individual instruction, peer tutoring, programmed instruction, token contracting and time-out punishment.

Problems with the non-handicapped student can be avoided to a limited degree by proper introduction of the handicapped student to the class. It is critical that the teacher initiate and reinforce the concept through his behavior towards the handicapped child.

Lastly, the problem can be a result of teacher behavior. Heron (1978) suggests the teacher asks himself, "To what extent am I interacting differently with my students? Am I giving more opportunities to respond or more attention to some students at the expense of others?" (p. 30) The teacher should be made aware of teaching performances through peer teacher feedback, to permit the teacher to alter his behavior. The author suggests the teacher can change his behavior through peer modeling.

Finally, McGinnis, Saverbry and Nicholas (1985) state:

> that educating children with behavior problems involves more than the formal goals of established

> behavior limits and academic skills. These students require the teaching of interpersonal and social needs. (p. 60)

These children are told what they shouldn't do. However, educators must substitute prosocial skills in their place, if we are to expect them to abandon unacceptable antisocial behaviors. One of the reasons that handicapped children were placed in self-contained classrooms was that they failed to gain acceptable social behavior through incidental learning or because they had insufficient practice of this acceptable behavior.

Greham (1984) tells us that "The special education enterprise thrives on discovery of personal incompetences in individuals." (p. 213) He uses the examples of children who are found physically incompetent are placed in classes reflecting these incompetencies such as health impaired. Similarly, children with intellectual and adaptive incompetencies are categorized as mentally retarded. Still other children are categorized as mentally retarded or having learning disabilities and behavior disorders. After testing and diagnosing these incompetencies, children are placed in the appropriate educational setting in the hope of remediating their incompetencies. The view is that their incompetencies will be remediated and progress will be made towards their becoming competent adults. However, most special children are diagnosed academically or intellectually incompetent,

rarely behaviorally incompetent and still fewer are diagnosed socially incompetent or, as Gresham (1984) calls, deficient in social skills. Gresham (1984) argues that increased focus and consideration on social skills in the mainstream process is needed. He contends that mainstreaming of handicapped students has little effect on the social competencies. He cites three reasons for the negative social competence outcomes of mainstreaming.

The first is that mainstreaming is based on three faulty assumptions: that placement of handicapped children in regular classrooms results in increased and more positive social interaction, increased social acceptance and decreased rejection will occur simply by mainstreaming; handicapped children will model the behavior of non-handicapped children. The second is the failure of regular and special education teachers to emphasize the importance of social skills instruction for mainstreamed handicapped children. The third is that the educator's supporting of mainstreaming ignores the importance of social competency. Gresham (1981, 1982b) has

> ...asserted that part of the reason for the relative lack of success of mainstreaming (in terms of social competence outcomes) is the faulty assumptions upon which mainstreaming has been based. (p. 255)

He calls for increased attention to improving social skills, through social skills training based on an instructional

model. Gresham states: "these instructional techniques include participant modeling, behavior rehearsal, direct reinforcement based techniques and peer imitation strategies." (p. 257)

The goal of a program developed by McGinnis and Goldstein (1984) is "not simply to teach the students to conform but rather to teach them positive ways of dealing with social conventions with their own feelings and the feelings of others and with stressful or conflict situations." (p. 161)

Chapter III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Statement of General Goals

The following goals were projected for this practicum:

1. to help special education students be mainstreamed into regular classrooms, so that they function both academically and socially.

2. To provide a support team approach for the mainstreamed students which establishes regular monitoring and on-going assistance, in terms of behavioral and educational problems.

3. To provide peer tutoring for each of the mainstreamed students to help with the academic skills.

4. To provide the mainstreamed student with social skills through social skills lessons.

5. To promote a positive attitude towards mainstreaming in the regular classroom teacher.

6. To promote satisfaction and a positive attitude towards mainstreaming in special education teachers.

Behavioral Expectations

The behavioral expectations which were considered as evidence of having achieved the general goals were as follows:

1. Each student mainstreamed will demonstrate success

both academically and socially in the regular classroom environment.

2. Each mainstreamed teacher will demonstrate cooperation and communication with the support team.

3. Each student will show an attainment of basic academic skills taught through successful peer-tutoring.

4. Each mainstreamed student will demonstrate acquisition of social skills through classroom behavior.

5. The regular classroom teacher involved in mainstreaming will demonstrate pride and a positive attitude towards mainstreaming.

6. The special education teachers involved with mainstreaming will demonstrate a positive attitude towards mainstreaming.

Standard of Performance

The success of each general goal and specific behavioral expectation were measured by achieving a minimal performance level on an evaluation tool:

1. a. When presented with a student evaluation form regarding feelings towards attending a regular classroom, each student mainstreamed will indicate a positive feeling towards the mainstreaming experience after a three-month program.

b. Each student mainstreamed will increase the time spent in the regular classroom from one hour per day initially to at least two hours per day by the end of the three month period.

c. Each student will obtain an acceptable rating of 2.5 on each item on the mainstreaming monitoring form to be completed by the regular teacher by the sixth week of the 12-week period

2. Evidence of communication between the mainstreaming regular classroom teacher and the evaluation team will be indicated in comments section of the Mainstreaming Monitoring Form.

3. When a check list of skills taught is completed, each student will show a mastery of the skills taught.

4. When presented with a questionnaire regarding student social skills pretest and posttest, each student will indicate an improvement of social skills after the three-month period.

5. When presented with a survey regarding the mainstreaming experience, each regular teacher involved will indicate a positive feeling towards mainstreaming and the mainstreamed student.

6. When presented with a survey regarding the mainstreaming experience, each of the special education teachers will indicate positive feelings towards mainstreaming.

Evaluation and Assessment Instrument

The following were the evaluation tools used to measure the success of goals and behavioral expectations:

1. a. The student self-evaluation form consists of 16 questions regarding the feelings towards mainstreaming. The student will respond to each question based on a five point scale indicating always, often, sometimes, seldom or never (see Appendix A).

   b. A log recording the time spent in the mainstreamed regular classroom will be kept. Each regular teacher will indicate the date and time the student spent in the classroom (see Appendix B).

   c. The mainstreaming monitoring form will consist of 13 questions regarding the student's classroom performance and relations with peers. Each regular classroom teacher responds to each question based on a five point scale indicating: excellent, very good, good, fair, poor (see Appendix C).

2. The amount and type of communication between the evaluating team and the regular classroom teacher as indicated by a weekly log will be kept by the writer of this practicum indicating problems and communication between the regular

classroom teacher and the evaluation team. In addition, a summary of comments offered by the regular classroom teacher on the additional comments section of the mainstreaming monitoring form will be kept (see Appendix C).

3. A student log consisting of the name of the student, date and skill taught will be recorded (see Appendix D).

4. a. The student social skills questionnaire consisting of 24 questions regarding social and interpersonal situations faced in mainstreaming will be included. Each student will respond to each question based on a five point scale indicating: always, often, sometimes, seldom, never. This will be done twice: once in the beginning of the three-month experience and once at the end (see Appendix E).

   b. The teacher evaluation of social skills survey consists of 12 questions regarding the regular classroom teacher's assessment of the student's social skills. The teacher will respond to each question based on a five-point scale indicating: always, often, sometimes, seldom, never (see Appendix F).

5. The regular teacher evaluation form consists of 20 questions regarding the regular teacher's feelings towards the mainstreaming experience. The teacher will respond to

each question based on a five-point scale indicating: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, no opinion (see Appendix G)

6. The special educator's evaluation form consists of 17 questions regarding the special education teacher's feelings towards the mainstreaming experience. The teacher will respond to each question based on a five-point scale indicating: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, no opinion (see Appendix H).

Plans for Analyzing Data

1. An indication of demonstrated success both academically and socially in the regular classroom were the following:

a. a mean score of 40 or higher on a 75 scale on the student self-evaluation form
b. a logged increase in the time to at least two hours each day
c. a mean score of 32.5 or higher on a 65 scale on the mainstream monitoring form
d. a mean score of 30 or higher on a 60 scale on the teacher evaluation of social skills survey.

2. An indication of success in establishing communication between the mainstreaming regular teacher and the evaluation team will be the amount of comments on the mainstream monitoring

form, the comments section, and the writer's log of events during the three months of the practicum.

3. The number of skills taught will be at least one skill a week.

4. The growth of social skills in the five mainstreamed students will be indicated if there is an improvement in rating of five skills or more between the pre-test and post-test of the student social skills questionnaire. Evidence of the student's acquiring social skills and indicating growth in classroom social interaction will be judged by the 30 or higher score on a 60 scale on the teacher social skills survey.

5. An indication of a positive feeling regarding mainstreaming by the five regular classroom teachers would be a 47.5 or higher on a 95 scale in teacher's self evaluation form.

6. An indication of a positive feeling regarding mainstreaming by the four special education teachers would be a 42.5 or higher on a 85 scale in the special educator's evaluation form.

Prior to the implementation of this practicum, there will be a meeting which will include all five regular classroom teachers, the four special education teachers and the evaluation team, including the school psychologist, guidance counselor and the principal. We will discuss the purpose of the social skills checklist, the teacher's social skills survey and the mainstream monitoring form; every teacher and team member will receive a copy of each.

Chapter IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions

An extensive search of existing literature concerning approaches to dealing with teaching children who have emotional and learning handicaps revealed a number of alternatives. However, most programs required either the commitment of large resources which went beyond the capacity of the school building staff or required an alteration of the educational system which went beyond the authority of school building staff and contradicts the guidelines set by the chief operating officer of the school district.

However, Wang, Rubenstein and Reynolds (1985) stated that "researchers and practitioners alike are increasingly calling for delivery of compensatory and special education service in the regular classes." In fact, Stainback, Stainback, Courtnage & Jaben (1985) stated, "the burden is placed on regular classroom teachers to make mainstreaming a success with the current structure of the schools." (p. 145) They suggested a change in the traditional school organization and structure to adapt teaching methods to the wide variety of learning styles. These changes, the writer believed, go beyond the scope of this practicum.

Wang, Rubenstein and Reynolds (1985) discussed a program

called the Adaptive Learning and Environment Model (ALEM) which is a product of the Learning Research and Development Center of the University of Pittsburgh. The model provided a learning environment in which all students can learn basic adademic skills, develop a confidence in their ability to learn, and adjust to the social and academic rigors of school. The features of this program included the following: a highly structured set of prescriptive learning activities, in addition to self-initiated learning activities to encourage individual interests and needs; an instructional-learning management system to make full use of instructional time and materials; parental involvement to increase communication and coordination of the learning in school with the home environment; flexible grouping and scheduling to make use of the talents of teachers and students while making full use of school resources; use of a data based staff development with written plans to help teachers develop skills to initiate new approaches and introduce these models in their schools.

Wang, Rubinstein and Reynolds (1985) concluded that the "models' goal was to provide instruction that meets the academic and social needs of most, if not all, students in regular class settings." (p. 62) The ALEM model was implemented in twenty-six mainstreamed classes in five New York City public schools, that range in size from twenty-one to thirty-five students. Approximately 15 percent of the

students in these twenty-six classes were classified as learning disabled, educable mentally retarded or socially and emotionally disturbed. The five schools were different in size, organization and demographic character. The authors reported significant gains in reading and math by both regular education and mainstreamed special education students. The mean grade equivalent gains for regular education students were 1.87 in math and 1.19 in reading, while special education students mainstreamed into these classes recorded 1.08 in math and 1.04 in reading.

Additional gains were made in the following areas: significant increases in student-teacher interaction; lack of difficulties in the classroom by both regular and special education students; a positive assessment of the program by teachers, administrators and parents; 30 percent of the mainstreamed special education students were recommended by teachers and the principal for decertification, while the average rate is 3 percent. The authors concluded:

> the data suggest the high possibility of breaking the cumulative deficit trend of academically at-risk students -- an important issue in special education. (p. 65)

In addition to the parents, administrator and staff advocating its continuation, other school systems anticipated beginning the program during its second year. However, a decision was made to abandon the program after the first year. The reason for abandonment of the program was based on a State regulation that excludes full-time special education services that are

state funded. This is the result of a state ruling that special education students in a regular classroom were no longer considered special education students and, therefore, not entitled to support from special education funds. Finally, special education students were returned to more restricted, self-contained classrooms and the program terminated, rather than to risk the forfeiting of state reimbursements.

The ALEM was just one example of a successful program of mainstreaming regular and special education students. The difficulty with this approach as stated at the beginning of this chapter was that they required a commitment of money and resources which are not available to the writer. Furthermore, neither the writer nor the principal of the building had the authority to redirect the resources of the school. In addition, the superintendent of the district was rather inflexible, especially in terms of school structure and would be unsympathetic to such a plan that is described especially if he would be risking state funds in the process -- which would result in loss of teaching positions and materials. However, the population correlated with the population in this practicum, and the goals of this program correlated favorably with the attention to basic academic and social skills, the individual learning style and flexible programming objectives. The large majority of educators will agree with 94-142 that handicapped students must be

socially and educationally mainstreamed to the maximum extent possible with non-handicapped students in the regular classroom, but the program described above went beyond the authority of the superintendent and conflicted with state guidelines.

Further, the flexibility necessary for its success was prohibited by large classes and other real world realities.

Gillet (1983) described a study conducted to determine success strategies for mainstreaming, through a survey given to directors of special education at the state, intermediate and local levels from around the country. She compiled a list of the most successful models.

One of the models was the Prescriptive Instructional Development model; this plans main component was a diagnostic center where a child study team of speech therapists, special and regular education teachers, psychologists, social workers, learning disability teachers, and other specialists tested children with standard and criterion-referrenced tests. They also gatheredinformation from diagnostic classrooms in the center. The results were qualitative and quantitative scores that provided a behavioral description of the child's learning and emotional difficulties. After the team diagnosed the significant individual differences of each student, the diagnostic instructional staff prescribed a plan to adjust the curriculum to allow for these individual differences. The center worked with the child and suggested remedial

strategies. This model for mainstreaming would be especially effective, since it worked directly with the child under conditions similar to the actual classroom and then tailored an educational plan for the child. Then the team structured a plan of action to be implemented in the classroom. The plan presented to the classroom teacher for implementation was a realistic, appropriate and meaningful plan for the classroom environment. The type of information in the Individual Educational Plan included: learning strategies, classroom management techniques, ways of facilitating the child's learning in small and large groups, and ways of modifying materials they recommended for the child's needs. Once the child was placed in the mainstream, the team was involved with an on-going monitoring which included continual observation and reevaluation when necessary. The staff was provided with follow-up assistance. This model may be effective with the population in this practicum; however, the resources and personnel required for this model were unavailable to the school or the district.

Another model was the Resource Plan which offers specialized instruction in skill areas where the child was experiencing most difficulty. The child receiving these services usually spent half a day or more in the regular classroom. A successful implementation of this plan depended on the continual and accurate communication between the resource and the regular classroom teacher. The disadvantage of this model was that

pulling the child from the regular classroom made both the child and the teacher ill-prepared for full-time mainstreaming in the future. The school already had a resource room program in operation. The problem with this program was the lack of communication between the regular and resource teachers and it only serviced children that were certified as resource room students on the initial special education evaluation. Those special education students in self-contained classrooms neither received resource room assistance nor spent classroom time in the mainstream.

Another was the Multi-Age grouping model. Children were grouped in multi-aged groups usually covering three grades, according to academic and social abilities with sub-groups for instruction. A special education teacher was assigned with three regular teachers in the multi-age setting. A disadvantage of this model was that the various age and maturity levels would make planning difficult. Also the staff required for this plan was prohibitive. This plan would be difficult to implement, since the staff required and the small registers required to make this plan successful would be impossible to implement in this district.

The peer tutoring model used non-handicapped students to help mainstream special education students with basic skills and assist them with classroom assignments. The studies indicated that those who do the teaching learn and grow, as do

the students who are tutored. Additionally, there was the value of social interaction between children other than handicapped children.

Description and Justification for Solution Selected

The emphasis of most mainstreaming programs described above focuses on academic skills and remediation exclusively, or couples remediation of academic skills with incidental methods of social interaction without a structured plan to help special education students to acquire these social skills. Many mainstreaming efforts are either a partial or total failure and always are misguided because as Gresham (1982) stated, "handicapped children have been placed in regular classrooms without the requisite social skills crucial for peer acceptance." (p. 423) The author cited three faulty assumptions that most current mainstreaming programs in our schools are based: the first is that the physical presence of handicapped students in the mainstream will cause an increase in social interaction, the second is that this physical presence will result in acceptance of them by non-handicapped students, third, handicapped students will model the behavior of non-handicapped students. Mainstreaming systems will result in increased social isolation and more restrictive social environments. Because of this lack of social skills, Gresham (1983) report "a rather large body of research suggests that exceptional

children are deficient in a variety of social skills." (p. 129) Further, he told us that when interaction occurs, it is usually negative. These studies reported that mentally retarded, learning disabled, and emotionally disturbed children were negatively received by their non-handicapped peers. McGinnis, Saverly & Nichols (1985) concurred that

> students who have been removed from the mainstream of education and placed into a special class due to their behavior disorders either have not picked up socially acceptable alternatives through incidental learning or have not received sufficient practice for these prosocial choices to be a consistent part of their behavior repertoire. (p. 160)

Therefore, since handicapped students were lacking in these skills it was incorrect to assume that they would learn these skills through either incidental learning or through practice in the mainstream.

The research concerning mainstreaming indicated that handicapped students were generally poorly accepted by their non-handicapped peers, because of their lack of social skills. The majority of regular classrooms were more restrictive environments than the self-contained classrooms. As a result, there was little social integration in the regular classroom which contradicted the mainstreaming law. Gresham (1982) stated that the assumption was that handicapped students, placed in the mainstreaming without social skills, can learn them through modeling. He stated, "It should be obvious that many handicapped children do not have the initiative skills to model certain

behaviors in the classroom." (p. 425)

In selecting an appropriate solution strategy to this problem, this writer considered a mainstream system that provided the following:

1. Both the social and academic integration of the special education student.

2. An on-going system of monitoring and evaluating the progress of the students' integration and providing assistance concerning behavioral and educational issues.

3. A peer-tutoring program to assist the student with academic skills.

4. A plan to actually teach special students to acquire social skills. (see Appendix J)

5. A positive attitude towards mainstreaming in the regular and special education teachers.

The best solution was an eclectic approach to mainstreaming. The writer combined the social skills training, peer tutoring and team approach for continuous monitoring, to solve this problem effectively. Heron (1978) "describes a composite process approach for decision-making which administrators, supervisors or teachers could use to maintain a mainstreamed child in their class." (p. 27)

First, the social and academic integration of the mainstreamed student was accomplished through an on-going

monitoring system, by a team composed of the principal, school psychologist and guidance counselor and special education teacher. This team provided solutions to academic or behavioral problems that might occur. The regular classroom teacher communicated with the team members either formally through the mainstream monitoring forms or informally through conversations with a team member.

Second, a peer-tutoring system was established. A responsible and caring child from each of the regular classes was chosen by the regular teacher to tutor the handicapped student. The guidance counselor assumed the responsibility of monitoring the tutoring and supervised the recording of progress, in addition to solving any problems that may occur.

Third, a checklist of twelve skills were taught to the five special education students. A list was given to the regular classroom teacher for her evaluation of the use of these twelve skills in the normal classroom environment. (see Appendix J)

Fourth, the immediate feedback and continuous assistance to the regular classroom teacher, in addition to the input of the special education teacher into the mainstreaming process, would result in a positive attitude of the regular and special education teachers involved.

Calendar Plan for Action

I. Preplanning -- September 19, 1986

A. Continued review of literature

B. Conducted a meeting with the five regular teachers and four special education teachers, the principal, the guidance counselor and the school psychologist

II. Implementation -- September 22 through December19, 1986

A. Made arrangements to place the five special education students in the mainstream class and establish a peer tutoring system that will be conducted during lunchtime and before school hours. Established a system of logging skills on a student log

B. Began the mainstream monitor form on a weekly basis and discussed with the regular teacher and with the team any problems that may have occurred

C. Administered student social skill questionnaire

D. Began the social skills lessons with the five special education students

E. At the end of the three-month implementation, the writer administered:

1. student self-evaluation form
2. regular teacher evaluation form
3. special educator's evaluation form

III. Results and Conclusions

A. Analyzed data collected through survey, evaluation and monitoring forms

B. Offer feedback and evaluation on logs

C. Write final report

Report of Action Taken

This writer's practicum was implemented in two phases: first the five regular and four special education teachers met with the support team, consisting of the school psychologist, the principal, and the guidance counselor. The purpose of this meeting was multipurposed. We discussed the students that were recommended to participate in mainstreaming, concerning a concensus of the group on their appropriateness for mainstreaming. In addition, we wanted to establish continuous communication between the special and regular education teachers, as well as the support team. We discussed the monitoring forms that were completed weekly in order to monitor the mainstreamed child's progress both academically and socially. Concurrently, we discussed the peer tutoring systems that were established at the implementation of mainstreaming. Each regular education teacher was asked to choose a child from his/her class whom he/she felt had the academic skills and the maturity to tutor a mainstreamed special education student in his/her class. Later we discussed the social skills lessons that were taught by the guidance counselor to the special education students, and how these twelve skills would be measured in the classroom behavior through the social skills questionnaire. Finally,

we discussed the student self-evaluation form, regular teacher evaluation form and the special educator's evaluation form. We also discussed the procedure for a tutor to log the skills they reviewed in the student log. The teachers involved suggested that a meeting each week on Monday mornings at 8:00 a.m. would be helpful in communicating successes, concerns or problems. So we agreed to meet each Monday morning for coffee at 8:00. The regular education teachers suggested that the writer visit their classrooms for the discussions concerning the placement of the mainstreamed students. The writer spent the entire day speaking to each of the five classes involved separately about special needs students, their differences, their similarities. We discussed the problems of being different and new in a classroom. After a frank discussion, the regular teacher, the writer and the school psychologist divided the class into smaller groups for more personalized discussions.

On September 22, the writer gathered the five special education students in his office and discussed the procedures for mainstreaming. We discussed what would be expected of them and what they can expect from the adults involved with this practicum. They had all been approached by their teachers and each teacher had a conference with each child's parent, either in person or over the phone. Each mainstreamed special education child was accompanied to his class by this

writer and introduced to his class and individually to his tutors. At the end of the morning of that first day, each of the five mainstreamed special education children were given a social skills questionnaire (see Appendix E). It was administered to each of the five mainstreamed special education students. This questionnaire consisted of 24 items covering the 12 social skills that were going to be taught over the three-month duration of this practicum. A retest at the end of the three-months of this practicum the writer would expect to see an improvement in the point average on this questionnaire.

The tutors and the five mainstreamed special education students met in a classroom each day during lunchtime. Each tutor was given a tutor's log (see Appendix D) which gave the student's name, the name of the tutor, the date, and skill taught by the tutor to the student on that date.

At the end of the frist day each regular teacher was given a recording log (see Appendix B) which gave the student's name, teacher, class, date, length of stay in the regular classroom and any additional comments. Each week a copy of this log was given to each member of the support team, and the special educators involved with that child. In addition, every Monday morning, each regular teacher was given a Mainstream Monitoring Form (see Appendix C) which included the mainstream special education student's name, the

name of the regular teacher, the date, six categories of classroom performance, seven questions concerning relationships with peers, and general information (time spent in the mainstream classroom and time spent speaking to the child individually).

The Recording Log, Mainstream Monitoring Form and the Tutor's Log were designed to increase communication among the regular and special education teachers and the support team, in order to ensure suggestions in this practicum and resolve any difficulties that may arise. In addition, each teacher, both regular and special education, as well as the members of the support team received copies of the lesson plans (see Appendix J) that the guidance counselor taught the special education students, as well as the Social Skills Checklist (see Appendix I). The lesson plans described the points which were discussed during each lesson, and the checklist listed the twelve skills which the writer hoped to achieve.

During the three month duration of this practicum there were several problems that needed the attention of the support team and the teachers involved in mainstreaming. They included: two special education students who wanted to remain in the regular classroom longer than the initial period of one hour, at the beginning of the practicum; one special

education student was handling his return to the restricted environment poorly, with bragging that he was better than his fellow students; two special education students were handling the less restricted environment of the school yard poorly; and one of the regular teachers was overcompensating for the special student's limitations and it was effecting the rest of the class. Each of these problems were resolved by the combined experience, knowledge and expertise of the support team and the teachers involved in the practicum.

The guidance counselor gave the skills lessons, 1 through 12, to the five special education students for the period of the practicum from September 22 to November 7, two lessons a week, with a review of all previous lessons after lessons six and twelve. The teachers were asked to reinforce these skills with their entire class. The five special education students had each of the skills reinforced through problem situations presented by the guidance counselor at each of their meetings, three times a week.

At the completion of the twelve weeks of the practicum, each student completed a Student Self Evaluation Form (see Appendix A) which explored their feelings about being mainstreamed. The five regular teachers completed the Regular Teacher's Self Evaluation Form (see Appendix G) which searched the feelings, concerns and evaluations of the mainstreamed teachers. Similarly, the Special Educator's

Evaluation Form (see Appendix H) searched the feeling, concerns and evaluations of the special education teachers involved. Finally, the Teacher Evaluation Social Skills Survey (see Appendix F) asked the regular education teacher to assess the Social Skills studied and reinforced by the counselor and whether or not the mainstreamed student incorporated them in his daily activities.

Chapter V

RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Results:

This practicum was designed to provide a mainstreaming experience for five special education students in the regular classroom, so that they could be successful both academically and socially. To assure this success, the writer developed a system of constant monitoring by a school support team, additional help through peer tutors, the development of social skills through social skills lessons and communication between the participants. In addition, the development of long-term mainstreaming programs was necessary to promote positive attitudes towards mainstreaming in the regular and special education teachers, as well as the five special education students. The writer was concerned that to this point, no mainstreaming program existed in the school or the district; and the administration was concerned that it had been cited by the state department of education for the lack of mainstreaming of special education students of any kind, contrary to the state laws. The fact that the school was cited for noncompliance with state laws concerning mainstreaming in itself indicated a problem existed and needed to be addressed.

The first general goal was to help special education students to function in a regular classroom successfully, both academically and socially. The standard of performance was threefold: each mainstreamed student would demonstrate positive feelings towards the mainstreaming experience and the regular classroom he attended, as demonstrated on the Student Self Evaluation Form (see Appendix A); next, each special education student would increase the time spent in the regular classroom to at least two hours a day by the end of the three-month period, as demonstrated by the Mainstream Monitoring Form (see Appendix B); the third was that every special education student would attain an acceptable rating of 2.5 on each item on the Mainstreaming Monitoring Form which was completed by the regular teacher. The criteria for analyzing the results for the first goal were: a mean score of 40 or higher on a scale of 80 in the Student Self Evaluation Form; a logged increase of at least 2 hours each day by the end of the 3-month period; a mean score of 32.5 or higher on a 65 point scale on the mainstreaming form.

The results of the Student Self Evaluation Form are as follows (see Table 1):

Each student received considerably more than the mean score of 40 or higher on the 75 point scale on the Student Self-Evaluation Form. They seemed to think that the mainstreaming

Table I

Summary of Mean Performance on the Student Self Evaluation Form

Student	Score
A	70
B	58
C	68
D	68
E	62

experience was a pleasant and positive undertaking. Particularly interesting was the final item on the Student Self Evaluation Form: "Was it a happy experience for me?"; all five of the mainstreamed special education students gave the question a mean score of 5 out of 5 points. This seemed to verify that mainstreaming was a happy experience for all of them. Another question on this form was: "Was it easy to belong in the mainstreamed class?" Each of the students gave this question a mean score of 5 out of 5 points, indicating an ease with which they became comfortable in the mainstreamed classroom.

There were several questions concerning the students' perception of their treatment by the regular teacher that the writer thought would be interesting to match with the two previous questions as indications of the regular teacher's contribution to making this an overall positive experience for the special education students, and easing the way for the their assimulation into the mainstreamed classroom. In each question on the form, 5 (or Always) was the most

positive response while 1 (or Never) was the least positive response (see Tables 2 and 3).

Table 2

Student Self Evaluation Form as an Indication of Ease of Assimulation And of Teacher Making It A Positive Experience

(Number responding to each value)

Item	5.0 Always	4.0 Often	3.0 Sometimes	2.0 Seldom	1.0 Never	Overall Mean
1	4	1				4.8
2	2	2	1			4.2
3	3	2				4.6
4	3	2				4.6
5	3		2			4.2
6	2	3				4.4
7	3	1	1			4.4
8	2	2	1			4.2
9	3	1	1			4.4
10	1	3	1			4.0

Table 3

Student Self Evaluation Form As An Indication of Mainstreamed Peers' Effectiveness in and Positive Experience

Item	5.0 Always	4.0 Often	3.0 Sometimes	2.0 Seldom	1.0 Never	Overall Mean
11	3	2				4.6
12	5					5.0
13	5					5.0
14	2	3				4.4

The information indicates that the regular teachers clearly contributed to the positive feelings toward mainstreaming of

the special education students, through their verbal treatment of them, and the intangible, nonspoken feeling of belongingness and assimulation to the mainstreamed classroom which the teachers helped to foster, particularly item number 1 which asked, "Does the teacher make me feel comfortable as if I belonged?". Four of the five students involved responded "always" to that question with the fifth student answering "often." Similarly, items 2 through 7 pertained to the teacher's treatment of the student in a friendly manner, acting fairly, being helpful and patient. In answering these questions, the students answered "always" or "often" in all except four responses. The writer believes that this is an indication of exceptional understanding and rapport between the special education students, regular teachers, and their peers in the regular class. This is born out in the responses of the regular teachers throughout the period.

Another measurement of obtainment of the first goal was an increase of the time spent in the regular classroom from 1 hour a day initially to at least 2 hours a day by the end of the period. The results are even better than the writer had hoped: Two of the special education students ended the implementation period by remaining in the regular classroom the entire morning, and stayed with the regular class for lunch in the lunchroom. The other three special education students varied their stay in the regular class-

room from 2 hours to the entire morning of about 3 hours depending on the lessons of the morning and scheduled preparation periods. The "time spent in mainstream classroom" was included in the Mainstream Monitoring Form.

The measurement of the obtainment of the first goal was that each student would obtain an acceptable rating of 2.5 on each item on the Mainstream Monitoring Form the teacher completed at the end of each week.

A mean score of 32.5 or higher on a 75-point scale on the Student Self-Evaluation Form would demonstrate success both academically and socially in the regular classroom. The results demonstrated an overall mean average for the five students ranging from 37.25 to 52.75 which was considerably higher than the 32.5 that was the minimum mean score to indicate success. Further, while there were several weeks where students 3 and 5 did not reach the minimum 32.5 for that week and several weeks where each individual student failed to achieve at least a 2.5 on an individual item on the Mainstream Monitoring Form, the results point to an overall success both academically and socially of the mainstreaming special education student in the regular mainstream classroom (see Table 4).

The second general goal of this practicum was to provide continuing support through a team approach for the mainstreaming of students which establishes regular

Table 4

Weekly Average Mean Score on Mainstreamed Monitoring Form

Student	Week Of 9/22	9/29	10/6	10/13	10/20	10/27	11/3	11/10	11/17	11/24	12/1	12/8	Overall Mean
1	33.0	33.0	36.0	38.0	39.0	42.0	47.0	48.0	49.0	49.0	41.0	48.0	41.92
2	45.0	45.0	51.0	56.0	55.0	58.0	54.0	56.0	54.0	52.0	55.0	52.0	52.75
3	30.0	26.0	40.0	31.0	40.0	36.0	36.0	38.0	38.0	41.0	42.0	49.0	37.25
4	46.0	45.0	38.0	40.0	34.0	41.0	35.0	47.0	39.0	42.0	42.0	37.0	40.50
5	28.0	27.0	37.0	36.0	40.0	42.0	50.0	45.0	48.0	48.0	47.0	50.0	41.50

monitoring and ongoing assistance. The behavioral objective the writer wished to achieve was that each mainstream teacher would maintain continuous cooperation and communication with the support team. The method in which this communication would be demonstrated was through the comments section in the Mainstream Monitoring Form and the writer's log of events during the three months of the practicum.

The results showed that there was considerable communication between the five mainstream regular education teachers and the support team. The comments ranged from problems concerning calling out in class to restlessness during class, not finishing assignments, and not accepting criticism well. Each instance where a problem occurred, the team had a conference with the regular education teacher involved; and the special education teacher was consulted and often included in the conference. During the conference, the problem was discussed, solutions were recommended, and a particular solution agreed upon by the participants. There was always a follow-up and never a need for further remediation, at least not in the three-month period of this practicum. There were instances where adjustment problems occurred between the mainstreamed special education student and the regular education students. In these cases, the team met with the teachers involved, then with the mainstreamed special education student and with the regular student involved. There seemed

to be sufficient cooperation and understanding that permitted resolution of these problems to be successful. An unexpected event concerning this area was that teachers often used additional space to write comments and offer suggestions. The teachers and students were always willing to resolve any problems that the mainstreamed special education student may have had. Another unanticipated outcome of this communication was a weekly breakfast meeting in the teachers' lunchroom, where the team and the teachers involved were encouraged to discuss their concerns and interests on a regular basis. The idea for these breakfast meetings came from the teachers involved.

The third general goal was to provide peer tutoring in academic skills for each of the mainstreamed special education students. The behavioral objective was that each student would show an attainment of basic skills taught through successful peer-tutoring. The standard performance would be that after a check list of skils taught was completed, each student would show a mastery of those skills. The logs of the five peer tutors showed that there were more skills taught than the targeted one skill a week. There were records kept of new skills taught and reinforced by the tutor; there was also evidence of transference to the classroom situation through good test marks, improved

ratings on the mainstream monitoring forms, and positive teacher's comments.

The fourth general goal was to provide the necessary social skills to the mainstreamed special education student through social skills lessons. The behavioral objective the writer hoped to achieve was that each special education student would show acquisition of social skills through classroom behavior in the regular classroom. The measurement of success of this goal and behavioral objective was to demonstrate if the following two things occur: (a) On the Student Social Skills Questionnaire, there was an improvement of five skills or more between pretesting and posttesting of the student; and (b) there was evidence of the student's acquiring social skills and growth in classroom social interaction as judged by a score of 30 or higher on a 60-point scale on the teacher's Social Skills Survey.

There were 12 social skills identified and taught by the writer (see Appendix I). The Student Social Skills Questionnaire consisted of 24 items; two items corresponded to and tested each of the social skills taught by the writer. The Student Social Skills Questionnaire was administered at the beginning of the practicum, before the social skills lessons were taught, and again at the end of the practicum, after the 12 lessons were taught. Questions 1 and 2 on the questionnaire correspond to item 1

on the Social Skills checklist; questions 3 and 4 correspond to item 2 on the Social Skills checklist. Every two questions on the questionnaire correspond in sequential order to the next item on the checklist. The results of the pretesting and posttesting indicate that the five students showed improvement in almost all of the 12 social skills. The writer decided to select five skill areas where there was most improvement. Table 5 shows those five areas as well as the combined scores of two questions for each skill area on the pretests and posttests.

The five special education students made most progress in these five areas: "getting the help you need," "participating in class," "not being baited," "accepting criticism," and "showing good sportsmanship." The writer believes that this questionnaire and the teachers' comments proved that there was substantial progress in the incorporation of social skills by the five mainstreamed children.

Another part of the plan was analyzing the results of the Teacher Evaluation Social Skills Survey. The intention of this instrument was to show the mainstreamed students' transferance of social skills to the regular classroom, as perceived by the regular teacher. Table 6 shows the results of this rating; the mean score for each student indicates that all five obtained a score of 30 or higher on a 60-point scale which was the standard for success.

Table 5

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test
Scores of Student Social Skills Questionnaire

Item	Social Skill Checklist	Corresponding Questionnaire	Student 1		2		3		4		5	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
2	Getting help	Item 3 & 4	6.0	10.0	4.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	6.0	9.0	5.0	9.0
5	Participating in Class	Item 9 & 10	5.0	10.0	6.0	9.0	6.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	5.0	8.0
6	Not being baited	Item 11 & 12	6.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	6.0	8.0	6.0	9.0
7	Accepting Criticism	Item 13 & 14	5.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	3.0	8.0	3.0	8.0	5.0	9.0
12	Showing good sportsmanship	Item 23 & 24	4.0	6.0	6.0	10.0	4.0	8.0	4.0	9.0	4.0	9.0

Table 6

Summary of Mean Performance on
Teacher Evaluation Social Skills Survey

Student	Mean Score
1	54
2	47
3	44
4	42
5	41

This indicates that the regular teachers involved in this practicum felt that the special education students in their class acquired the basic social skills necessary for maintaining them in a regular classroom. In fact, four of the five teachers indicated that the mainstreamed student acquired more social skills than some of the regular students in their class. Further, the four special education teachers indicated that their mainstreamed students' social skills carried over in the special education class and was a model for the other special education students who were not mainstreamed. These were all unexpected results; however, they were welcomed and were an indication that the social skills training had a carry-over effect on mainstreamed special education students, as well as the other special education students who were not mainstreamed.

The fifth general goal was to promote a positive attitude towards mainstreaming in the regular classroom teacher. The behavioral objective was for the teacher to indicate a posi-

tive feeling towards mainstreaming in a survey, Regular Teacher's Self Evaluation Form. This writer's indication of a positive feeling regarding mainstreaming by the five special education teachers was set at 42.5 or higher on a 85-point scale in this form, as indicated in Table 7.

Table 7

Mean Score on Regular Teachers' Self Evaluation Form

Teacher	Mean Score
1	72
2	63
3	65
4	61
5	60

The results showed that all of the regular teachers had positive feelings towards mainstreaming and their score on this survey was much higher than the minimum score of 42.5. Of particular importance were several questions which summarized the teacher's positive feelings towards mainstreaming. To item 10, "The special education student progressed well, academically and socially, in my class," all five teachers responded with positive agreement. This indicated a generally favorable feeling that the special education students in their classes made sufficient academic and social progress during this implementation period. In item 6, "The integration of special education and regular education students helps improve understanding and acceptance of their differences,"

all four regular education teachers agreed with the statement, one strongly agreed. This writer believes that these responses indicate that the teachers are beginning to understand that the proper integration of special and regular education students help foster understanding. Further, item 2, which states: "Most of the things I did in the classroom was appropriate for the mainstreamed special education student," all five regular education teachers responded, agreed or strongly agreed. This seems to indicate that the mainstreamed students were academically and socially prepared to function in the regular classroom. Similarly in item 9, "The special education student was not more likely to be disruptive in a regular class," all five teachers strongly agreed. This indicates that the teachers felt that the special education student was not likely to take advantage of the freedom in the regular class and misbehave. Finally, in item 19, "I would like to be an advocate for mainstreaming and try to persuade others to experiment with it," all five teachers agreed with this statement. This, perhaps, is the most significant item concerning their positive feelings towards mainstreaming, since they are all willing to advocate mainstreaming to their peers on the staff. This, in itself, is a strong positive statement for the mainstreaming program.

The last general goal was to promote satisfaction and

a positive attitude towards mainstreaming in the special education teachers. The behavioral objective was to have special education teachers involved in mainstreaming express positive attitudes towards mainstreaming. An indication of these positive attitudes regarding mainstreaming by the special education teachers was a score of 42.5 or higher on a 85-point scale in the Special Educator's Evaluation Form. The results are shown on Table 8.

Table 8

Summary of Mean Performances
on the Special Educators Evaluation Form

Special Educator	Mean Score
1	73
2	70
3	75
4	73

Table 8 indicates that the four special education teachers received a mean score well above the 42.4 minimum score for success. This seems to attest to the positive feelings the special education teachers felt towards mainstreaming. In items 1 and 2 which asked if the mainstream experience was a positive one, and whether they thought the student progressed academically and socially, all four teachers responded in agreement to both questions. Like their regular education counterparts, special educators believed that integration helped improve understanding and

acceptance of differences between regular and special education students. Further, they responded positively to items 3 and 4 which asked if their suggestions and comments were given serious consideration and whether there was positive cooperation and feedback among the special education and regular teachers and the support team. This seems to reinforce a positive accomplishment set in behavioral objective 2, maintaining cooperation and communication. Finally, two questions, items 12 and 13 seemed to indicate that the special educators were committed to mainstreaming students where appropriate. Item 12 stated that "Special education students should not be in special classes from regular education students." All four teachers agreed. Similarly in Item 13, which asked whether they thought the student made greater progress academically and socially in the regular class than in the more restricted classroom, all four teachers agreed that their students had made more progress.

Conclusions

Results of the evaluations forms filled out by the subject matter teachers and the special education teachers participating in the practicum revealed that they have positive feelings toward the mainstreaming experience. The students' success as indicated on the results of the main-

streaming Monitoring Form shows that constant monitoring of the special education student and communication by all the participants in the mainstreaming process can be effective in ensuring success. In addition, the instruction of social skills of the mainstreamed student and peer tutoring will further increase the success both academically and socially of the mainstreamed student, and will have a carry-over effect in both the regular and special education classroom, as indicated in the Teachers' Evaluation Social Skills Survey.

Clearly, this mainstreaming program was effective and there is a need for such programs in the public schools. Each teacher participant indicated that he/she would not only be willing to participate in the future but also advocate mainstreaming to his/her peers on the staff. This appears to be a strong endorsement for mainstreaming and the positive feeling these teachers feel for this process.

Recommendations

This writer highly recommends that the mainstreaming process continue with at least two of these students being recommended for reevaluation and placed in a regular class next year. In addition, this program should be expanded with the participants of this first mainstreaming experiment becoming resource personnel for other special and regular

education teachers.

Also, there should be a school-wide training program where the evaluation team participating in this practicum, other district office personnel and the special education staff are asked to conduct workshops for training teachers interested in participating in a mainstreaming program, as well as parents of special and regular education students who will be involved with future mainstreaming programs.

There should be an on-site professional library for the staff to specifically stimulate and encourage special and regular educators to experiment with strategies for mainstreaming students. This resource can be used by professionals and parents to better understand the value and purpose of mainstreaming special education students. The material in the library could be used to eliminate parent and teacher fears concerning mainstreaming.

The educators, parents, administrators and staff involved in mainstreaming should lobby for funds to include paraprofessional help in the classrooms with mainstreamed special education students so that they could assist the teacher and the special education student in the mainstreaming process.

In conclusion, the implications of the work and results of this practicum are both important and significant. Since the school district does not, at this practicum writing, have a mainstreaming program or guidelines in the mainstream-

ing of special education students, professionals must develop their own program. If not, we will not be complying with Public Law 94-142, and more importantly, deny the special education student the right to a least restricted environment.

Therefore, it is extremely important to educate and encourage other educators in the school district, as well as the city. The results of the preliminary research concerning this problem indicate that ignorance, misconception and mistrust are the main causes for the lack of participation in mainstreaming. This practicum program can be a solution to mainstreaming special education students and can better equip educators with the skills and strategies for successful mainstreaming of special education students.

Dissemination

During the implementation of this practicum, the writer approached other teachers and professionals to help them understand the mainstreaming process. Several of these people have expressed interest in becoming participants in future mainstreaming programs.

The district supervisor of guidance has asked the writer to conduct a workshop for other counselors to replicate the program in other schools in the district. In addition, the principal of the school in which this

practicum was implemented has indicated that this mainstreaming format will be a permanent program in the school.

For wider dissemination of this practicum, the writer's aim is to read this paper to the annual convention of the New York State Cahpter of the American Association of Counseling and Development.

Finally, the writer hopes to have parts of this practicum included in a journal article in the School Counselor or Elementary School Guidance and Counseling.

References

Aloia, G. F. (1983). An effective approach to monitoring the mainstreamed student, The Journal for Special Educators, 19 (2), 21-24.

Aloia, G., & Aloia, S. (1983). Teacher expectation questionnaire: A scale to help determine the most appropriate placement for the mainstreamed handicapped student, The Journal for Special Educators, 19 (2), 11-20.

Biklen, D. P. (1985). Mainstreaming: From compliance to quality, Journal of Learning Disabilities, 18 (1), 58-61.

Campbell, N., Dobson, J., & Bost, J. (1985). Educator perceptions of behavior problems of mainstreamed students, Exceptional Children, 51 (4), 289-303.

Gillet, P. (1983). Model for mainstreaming, The Journal for Special Educators, 19 (1), 1-12.

Gresham, F. M. (1982). Misguided mainstreaming: The case for social skills training with handicapped children, Exceptional Children, 48 (5), 422-432.

Gresham, F. M. (1983). Social skills instruction for exceptional children, Theory Into Practice, 21 (2), 129-133.

Gresham, F. M. (1984). Social skills and self-efficacy for exceptional children, Exceptional Children, 51 (3), 253-261.

Hauser, C. (1979). Evaluating mainstream programs: Capitalizing on a victory, The Journal of Special Education, 3 (2), 107-129.

Heron, T. (1978). Maintaining the mainstreamed child in the regular classroom: the decision-making process, Journal of Learning Disabilities, 2 (4), 26-31.

Larrivee, B., & Cook, L. (1979). Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teacher attitude, The Journal of Special Education, 13 (3), 315-324.

McGinnis, E., Sauerby, L., & Nichols, P. (1985). Skill-streaming: teaching social skills to children with behavioral disorders, Teaching Exceptional Children, 17 (3), 160-167.

McGinnis, E. & Goldstein, A. (1984). Skillstreaming the elementary school child. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Mori, A. A. (1979). The handicapped child in the mainstream: new roles for the regular educator, Education, 99 (3), 243-249.

Newberger, D. (1978). Situational socialization: An effective interaction component of the mainstreaming reintegration construct, The Journal of Special Education, 12, (2), 113-121.

Powell, J. V. (1980). Mainstreaming becomes a really through continuous progress programs, Education, 100, (4), 382-385.

Ryan, D. (1984). Mainstreaming isn't just for students anymore, Journal of Learning Disabilities, 17 (3), 167-169.

Safan, S. & Safran, J., (1984). Elementary teachers' tolerance of problem behaviors, The Elementary School Journal, 85 (2), 237-243.

Salend, S. & Lutz, J. (1984). Mainstreaming or mainlining: a competency based approach to mainstreaming, Journal of Learning Disabilities, 17 (1), 27-29.

Simpson, R. & Edwards, L. (1980). Mainstreaming behavior disordered students: a perspective, Journal of Research and Development in Education, 13 (4), 58-73.

Stainback, W., Stainback, S., Courtnage, L. & Jaben, T. (1985). Facilitating mainstreaming by modifying the mainstream, Exceptional Children, 52 (2), 144-152.

Thornburgh, J. (1980). Into the mainstream, Contemporary Education, 51 (3), 161-163.

Wang, M., & Birch, J. (1984). Comparison of a full-time mainstreaming program and a research room approach, Exceptional Children, 51 (1), 33-40.

Wang, M. & Reynolds, M. (1985). Avoiding the "Catch 22" in special education reform, Exceptional Children, 51 (6), 497-502.

Wang, M., Rubenstein, J., & Reynolds, M. (1985). Clearing the road to success for students with special needs, Educational Leadership, 43 (1), 62-67.

Wilkes, H., Bireley, M. & Schultz, J. (1979). Criteria for mainstreaming the learning disabled child into the regular classroom, Journal of Learning Disabilities, 12 (4), 46-51.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT SELF EVALUATION FORM

APPENDIX A

Student Self Evaluation Form

	Always	Often	Some-times	Seldom	Never
1. Does the teacher make me feel comfortable and as if I belong?	5	4	3	2	1
2. Does he treat me like the other children in his class?	5	4	3	2	1
3. Does he speak to me in a friendly way as he speaks to the other children?	5	4	3	2	1
4. Does he answer my questions when I need help?	5	4	3	2	1
5. Does he help me with work I can not do?	5	4	3	2	1
6. Was the teacher patient with me even when I'm not doing what I should be doing?	5	4	3	2	1
7. Has the teacher been fair with me?	5	4	3	2	1
8. Did the teacher reward me with a good word or other reward when I did some-thing well?	5	4	3	2	1
9. Was the teacher fair when he settled arguments?	5	4	3	2	1
10. Were his lessons interesting?	5	4	3	2	1
11. Were the children in the class friendly?	5	4	3	2	1
12. Was it easy to belong in the main-stream class?	5	4	3	2	1
13. Did you have one or more good friends in the mainstream class?	5	4	3	2	1
14. Did the children in the mainstream class include me in games?	5	4	3	2	1
15. Was it a happy experience for me?	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX B

RECORDING LOG

APPENDIX B

RECORDING LOG

Student's Name: _____

Teacher: _____ Class: _____

Date	Length of Stay In The Regular Classroom	Comments

APPENDIX C

MAINSTREAM MONITORING FORM

APPENDIX C

Mainstream Monitoring Form

Name: _____

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
A. Classroom Performance					
. Classwork	5	4	3	2	1
. Behavior during lessons	5	4	3	2	1
. Attention on tasks	5	4	3	2	1
. Completion of tasks	5	4	3	2	1
. Obeys class rules	5	4	3	2	1
. Asks for help appropriately	5	4	3	2	1
B. Relations with Peers					
. Gets along with peers	5	4	3	2	1
. Works well with others	5	4	3	2	1
. Shares with others	5	4	3	2	1
. Participates in activities	5	4	3	2	1
. Able to take criticism	5	4	3	2	1
. Able to give constructive criticism	5	4	3	2	1
. Respects the rights and property of others	5	4	3	2	1

C. General Information

. Time spent in mainstream classroom _____

. Time it was necessary to speak to the child privately _____

D. Any additional information you feel would be helpful. Any help needed concerning an academic and/or behavior problem. (Please describe)

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

TUTOR'S LOG

APPENDIX D

TUTOR'S LOG

Student's Name: _____

Name of Tutor: _____

Date	Skill Taught

APPENDIX E

STUDENT SOCIAL SKILLS QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX E

Student Social Skills Questionnaire

	Always	Often	Some-times	Seldom	Never
1. It is easy for me to sit and listen to someone speak	5	4	3	2	1
2. Without being reminded, I listen to the teacher when she speaks	5	4	3	2	1
3. I wait for my teacher to finish what he is doing and ask for help in a friendly way	5	4	3	2	1
4. I raise my hand to ask for help	5	4	3	2	1
5. I listen closely when my teacher is giving directions without talking or looking elsewhere	5	4	3	2	1
6. I try to repeat the directions to myself	5	4	3	2	1
7. I finish my assignments in class	5	4	3	2	1
8. I go over the assignments, one item at a time in class, before I give them in	5	4	3	2	1
9. I think about what I'm going to say in class	5	4	3	2	1
10. I keep my answers on the topic the teacher and class is discussing	5	4	3	2	1
11. I do not talk or look at others when the teacher is talking	5	4	3	2	1
12. I keep on working even if people are noisy or playing around me	5	4	3	2	1
13. The teacher can correct me without my getting angry	5	4	3	2	1
14. I can take it when my classmates correct me	5	4	3	2	1
15. I can ask to join into a group game	5	4	3	2	1

	Always	Often	Some-times	Seldom	Never
16. I don't get angry if I'm not included in a game	5	4	3	2	1
17. I share with others	5	4	3	2	1
18. I share other's things more than I share my things	5	4	3	2	1
19. I tell others I am sorry when I do something wrong	5	4	3	2	1
20. I find it easy to apolize to other people	5	4	3	2	1
21. I talk about a problem more often than fight	5	4	3	2	1
22. I can walk away from a problem and cool down before I will fight	5	4	3	2	1
23. I congratulate other team members whether I win or lose	5	4	3	2	1
24. I tell the other team that it was a good game whether I win or lose	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX F

TEACHER EVALUATION SOCIAL SKILLS SURVEY

APPENDIX F

Teacher Evaluation Social Skills Survey

	Always	Often	Some-times	Seldom	Never
1. Is the student a good listener when you or a classmate is speaking	5	4	3	2	1
2. Can the student wait for help with a problem and ask politely for help	5	4	3	2	1
3. Can the student follow your directions and complete the task in the allotted time	5	4	3	2	1
4. Does the student complete the assignment and correct them along with the class	5	4	3	2	1
5. Does the student contribute appropriate ideas to class discussions	5	4	3	2	1
6. Does the student ignore distractions	5	4	3	2	1
7. Does the student accept criticism from peers and adults	5	4	3	2	1
8. Does the student participate in games and group activities appropriately	5	4	3	2	1
9. Does the student share with others willingly	5	4	3	2	1
10. Can the student accept blame without getting angry	5	4	3	2	1
11. Does the student find alternatives for fighting, such as adult intervention, walking away and cooling off	5	4	3	2	1
12. Does the student show good sportsmanship by complimenting and congratulating the other team	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX G

REGULAR TEACHER'S SELF EVALUATION FORM

APPENDIX G

Regular Teacher's Self Evaluation Form

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1. Having a mainstreamed special education student is a challenging task	5	4	3	2	1
2. Most of the things I did in the classroom was appropriate for the mainstreamed special education student	5	4	3	2	1
3. The behavior of the special education student required more patience than the other children	5	4	3	2	1
4. The special education student should not be in separate classes from regular education students	5	4	3	2	1
5. The extra attention special education students needed was not harmful to the rest of the class	5	4	3	2	1
6. The integration of Special education and regular education students helps improve understanding and acceptance of their differences	5	4	3	2	1
7. It was not more difficult to gain and keep control of the class with the special education student in the class	5	4	3	2	1
8. The special education student's behavior did not set off other children in the class	5	4	3	2	1
9. The special education student was not more likely to be disruptive in a regular class	5	4	3	2	1
10. The special education student progressed well, academically and socially, in my class	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX G -- REGULAR TEACHER'S SELF EVALUATION FORM

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
11. The special education student progressed better academically and socially in my classroom then he would have in a self-contained classroom	5	4	3	2	1
12. Mainstreaming gave the special education student more independance	5	4	3	2	1
13. The special education student needed no more guidance on what and how to perform	5	4	3	2	1
14. Mainstreaming has no negative affect, both academically or socially	5	4	3	2	1
15. The special education student was not socially isolated by the regular classroom students	5	4	3	2	1
16. The special education student must be given the opportunity to be mainstreamed, when appropriate	5	4	3	2	1
17. I would like to try mainstreaming again if the student and conditions were appropriate	5	4	3	2	1
18. The regular classroom students benefitted from the experience	5	4	3	2	1
19. I would like to be an advocate for mainstreaming and try to persued others to experiment with it	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX H

SPECIAL EDUCATOR'S EVALUATION FORM

APPENDIX H

Special Educator's Evaluation Form

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1. Having a special education student mainstreamed is a positive experience	5	4	3	2	1
2. The special education student progress academically and socially because of mainstreaming	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was positive cooperation and feedback between me and the regular classroom teacher	5	4	3	2	1
4. My suggestions and comments were given serious consideration in the mainstreaming process	5	4	3	2	1
5. The integration of special education and regular education students help improve understanding and acceptance of their differences	5	4	3	2	1
6. The fact that a student was mainstreamed was a positive aspect to the rest of my class	5	4	3	2	1
7. The mainstreamed child was easier to control after his time in the regular classroom	5	4	3	2	1
8. The mainstreamed child gained more independance because of mainstreaming	5	4	3	2	1
9. The special education student never set off the other children in the regular class	5	4	3	2	1
10. The mainstreamed child gained skills because of being placed in a regular class	5	4	3	2	1
11. Most of the assignments in the regular class were appropriate for the special education student	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX H -- SPECIAL EDUCATOR'S EVALUATION FORM

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
12. Special education students should not be in separated classes from regular education students	5	4	3	2	1
13. The mainstreamed student progress better academically and socially in the regular classroom than in my classroom	5	4	3	2	1
14. The mainstream student was not socially isolated by his peers in the self-contained classroom	5	4	3	2	1
15. Special education students should be given the opportunity to be mainstreamed when appropriate	5	4	3	2	1
16. I would like to try mainstreaming again if the student and conditions were appropriate	5	4	3	2	1
17. I would like to be an advocate for mainstreaming and try to persued others to experiment with it.	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX I

SOCIAL SKILLS CHECKLIST

APPENDIX I

Social Skills Checklist

I. Attention Skills:

1. Being a good listener
2. Getting the help you need
3. Following directions
4. Following through on assignments
5. Participating in class
6. Not being baited
7. Accepting criticism

II. Interpersonal Relations:

8. Participating in activities
9. Sharing with others
10. Admitting you are wrong
11. Alternatives to fighting
12. Showing good sportsmanship

APPENDIX J

SOCIAL SKILLS LESSONS

APPENDIX J

Skill 1 -- Being a good listener:

Steps:

1. clear your desk of everything except what you need for the lesson
2. watch the person who is talking
3. sit still; don't look, touch or talk to anyone else
4. ask a question about what the person is speaking about to:
   a. clear up something you don't understand
   b. find out more about the topic
   c. add something you thought of to the topic

Situations:

School -- the teacher is teaching a new skill
Home -- your parents are asking your opinion on something
Peer Group -- another child is explaining something new they did

Skill 2 -- Getting the help you need:

Steps:

1. Have I tried doing it myself	Discuss the ways of helping yourself . reread directions . look up past assignments
2. How can I get the person's help	Discuss ways of getting help in various settings: home, school, with friends
3. I must wait until the person can help me without disturbing everyone else	I must wait my turn with disrupting the class or if at home
4. What is a polite way of asking for help	Ask the question politely. Say thank you. Accept criticism. Discuss/use model behavior
5. Have I tried doing it again myself after the person explained it to me	. attempt to complete the task . listen carefully when it is gone over . try to understand what you did wrong
6. What will I do if I still don't understand	. ask for additional help at appropriate time . ask the adult to explain it again

Situations:

School -- if a new skill and you don't understand how to do it or you don't understand the directions

APPENDIX J (continued)

Home -- You're late for school and you want to ask your mother about something
Peer group -- You want your friend to teach you a new game next

Skill 3 -- Following directions

1. Listen carefully	concentrate on what is being said
2. Ask for help	work on skills of asking (review Skill 2)
3. Repeat the directions to yourself	
4. Follow through on the directions	

Situations:

School -- An adult gives you directions for a test
Home -- Your parents give you directions to grandma's house
Peer Group -- Your best friend gives you directions for a new game

Skill 4 -- Follow through on assignments

1. Am I finished?	Ask yourself did I read each item over carefully
2. Review each item	Go over each answer a second time
3. When you're done, wait for directions	Listen for the teacher's instructions on what to do
4. Listen carefully as it is gone over in class	Correct answers; ask questions; give answers
5. Be honest, give yourself credit for right answers. Correct wrong answers	If you have been honest, reward yourself

Situations:

School -- Finish a lesson your teacher gives you
Home -- Finish a job at home
Peer group -- Plan a project with a classmate and follow through

APPENDIX J (continued)

Skill 5 -- Participating in class

1. Think about what you are going to say, want to ask, or want to contribute	talk about relevant ideas, examples
2. Think about what it has to do with the topic	discuss how to say it
3. Raise your hand without calling out	
4. Tell your idea or ask your question	

Situation:

School -- Say something in class
Home -- Discuss something at dinner
Peer group -- Discuss something with a group of friends before school, at lunch, after school

Skill 6 -- Not being baited

1. Stop, count to ten	
2. Continue what you are doing	do role playing
3. Think about:	
a. walking away	discuss how to ask to leave the room
b. doing your work	
c. write down what you're feeling	
d. talk to a friend or adult	discuss the idea of choosing the right person (example)
4. Try one of the choices	
5. Reward yourself	discuss ways to do it

Situation:

School -- a student accuses you of copying
Home -- your brother or sister
Peer Group -- A friend calls you a liar

APPENDIX J (continued)

Skill 7 -- Accepting criticism

1. Count to ten
2. Think about what was said; try to see it the way someone else does — Write down thoughts
3. Review choices:
   a. tell the person how you feel
   b. walk away
   c. discuss your reason after you calm down
   d. go to another person to discuss it — Discuss ways to discuss feelings

Situation:

School -- The class laughs at your answer in class
Home -- Your mother criticises you in front of company
Peer group -- Your best friend laughs when you fall down

Skill 8 -- Participating in activities

1. Think about whether you want to be a part of the group — Discuss really wanting to join in as opposed to disrupting the group
2. Think about how you are going to do it and when — Discuss ways to join in; when to wait
3. Think about ways to ask to join in — Discuss phrases
4. Think about alternatives if you can't join in:
   a. watch the activity
   b. walk away
   c. join in another activity

Situations
School -- join a game during free time
Home -- join in a game with your brother or sister
Peer group -- join a club or organization

Skill 9 -- Sharing with others

1. Think about whether you want to share — Discuss feelings when things are shared or not shared

2. Think about what and with whom you want to share	Discuss feelings of being left out
3. Think about a way to ask	Discuss a good time to share
4. Think about what sharing means	Other people's needs giving up part of your ownership
5. Think about leaving out others or being left out	

Situations:

School -- Offer to share material or supplies with peers
Home -- Offer candy or a treat with a brother or sister
Peer Group -- Offer to share a toy with someone you don't usually speak with

Skill 10 -- Admitting you're wrong

1. Decide if you've done something wrong	Discuss situations that you will need to apologize
2. Think about what you will do about it: a. write a note b. tell the person you are sorry	Discuss what to say
3. Think about where and when you will tell the person	Discuss whether it should be alone or with others
4. Think about what you will say	Discuss a way to apologize
5. Do it	

Situations:

School -- You accidently broke the teacher's pen
Home -- You broke your father's glasses
Peer group -- You accidently broke someone's toy

Skill 11 -- Alternatives to Fighting

1. Stop and count	Discuss ways to let the anger out
2. Think about what you're going fight about	Discuss what will happen if you fight

3. Think about other ways:
   a. walk away
   b. talk to the other person
   c. ask an adult to help settle it
   d. try to talk to the other person

Ways to ask to leave the room, yard, etc.

Discuss ways to understand the other person's anger

Teacher, friend, parent

4. Pick the best choice

Situations:

School -- someone pushes you
Home -- your sister or brother wants to fight with you
Peer group -- someone gets angry with you in the yard

Skill 12 -- Showing good sportsmanship

1. Think about whether you played the game fair and did your best

Discuss playing fairly

2. Think about what you can tell the other team:
   a. good win
   b. good game, you deserve to win
   c. you are improving

3. Pick the best choice

4. Help your teammates pick the right choice

Situations:

School -- you win or lose a close game
Home -- you lose a game with your sister or brother
Peer group -- your best friend loses the game for your team